



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,630	05/11/2001	Andrew Strawn	367.40103X00	5351
20457	7590	08/26/2004	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP			TORRES, MARCOS L	
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1800			2683	
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889			DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/852,630	STRAWN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Marcos L Torres	2683

*--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

THE REPLY FILED 13 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

a)  The period for reply expires \_months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

(a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

(d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding applicants argument's to claim 1, 6, 10-15, 17 and 19-22 that there is no means for urging the second housing away from the first housing to aid the removal of the second housing from the first housing; Fuhrmann discloses a press on/catch function as acknowledged in the amendment, this technique consist in pressing the external wall to counter the outwardly acting spring force of the catch projection until it is caught by the notches. In the removal procedure once the catch projection are not in the catch position they will have an outwardly acting spring force away of the housing (col. 3, lines 5 - col. 4, line 19). Therefore, Fuhrmann discloses urging the second housing away from the first housing to aid the removal of the second housing from the first housing.

Regarding applicants argument's to claims 8 and 9 that there is no spring associated with a housing in the Fuhrmann reference; Fuhrmann discloses a spring force associated with the housing (see col. 3, lines 20-27).

Regarding applicants argument's that there is no motivation to modify the teachings of Fuhrmann; the applicant is reminded that claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation in view of the specification; therefore no modification of the Fuhrmann reference is necessary.

Regarding applicants argument's that it is unclear the rejection of claims 5 and 6, because there is no item 18 on fig. 1, figures 1-5 show a flexible hinge and that item is showed on all figures. Therefore the current rejection on record stands.



WILLIAM FROST  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600